

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 23, 2007, claims 16-17 and 19-21 were withdrawn by the Examiner; claims 1, 7, 9, 11-13 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,881,042); claims 2-5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo et al. in view of Yumita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,072); claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo et al. in view of Kim (U. S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0258543); and claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo et al. in view of Kawakami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,632,645). The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4, 11 and 22 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to include some of the features of claim 4.

Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The features of cancelled claim 12 have been incorporated into independent claim 11.

Claims 1-25 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 102(e) Rejections of claims 1, 7, 9, 11-13 and 23-25:

Claim 1 recites:

“A linear compressor comprising:
an external casing forming a compressing chamber;
an outer core disposed in the external casing;
an inner core assembly disposed inside of the outer core interacting with the outer core
wherein **the inner core assembly comprising:**
 an inner core,
 an upper cover combined to an upper part of the inner core,
 a bottom supporting part combined to a bottom part of the inner core, and
 at least one connection member passing through the inner core, to connect
 the upper cover with the bottom supporting part.”

Heo et al. fails to recite the features as recited in claim 1, for example. Amended claim 11 now recites features somewhat similar to those recited in amended claim 1.

In contrast, Heo et al. discusses a reciprocating compressor including a reciprocating motor an outer stator, and an inner stator provided with at least one step portion at both sides thereof, and an armature linearly moving therebetween. The compressor further includes a compression unit having a cylinder and a piston inserted in the cylinder to receive a linear and reciprocal driving force of the motor and compress a gas. A suction unit sucking a gas into the compression unit and a discharge unit to discharge the gas compressed to an outside of the container (see Abstract; and column 4, lines 26-48).

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the inner stator 220 of Heo et al. is comparable to the Applicants "inner core". The Examiner further asserts that the stopper 743 and the front frame 710 of Heo et al. are respectively comparable to the Applicants "upper cover" and "bottom supporting part" as recited in claim 1, for example.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. As illustrated in FIG. 4 of Heo et al., the inner stator 220 does not include the stopper 743 and the front frame 710. Instead, the frame unit 700 includes both the front frame and the stopper. Further, the stopper 743 is not connected to the front frame 710. In addition, Heo et al. fails to discuss "at least at least one connection member passing through the inner core, to connect the upper cover with the bottom supporting part" as recited in amended claim 1. That is, Heo et al. fails to discuss that a connecting member passing through the inner stator to connect the stopper 743 with the front frame 710.

Regarding the 103(a) Rejections of claims 2-5, 14, 18 and 22:

Dependent claims 2-4, 14, 18 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 11 respectively. Therefore, the comments mentioned above may also be applied here.

In addition, neither Yumita, Kim nor Kawakima, individually or combined, make up for the deficiencies of Heo et al. as mentioned above.

In contrast, Yumita merely discusses a linear actuator and a compressor device using the linear actuator. The linear actuator includes inner yokes, outer yokes forming gaps between themselves and the inner yokes and a movable body provided with planar magnets in the gaps (see Abstract and FIGS. 2A and 2B).

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that Kim does not qualify as prior art. The present invention claims priority to Korean Application No. 2003-39679 filed on June 19, 2003. Kim claims priority to Korean Application Nos. 2003-40275 and 2003-46421 filed on June 20, 2003 and July 9, 2003, respectively. A Certified/Verified English Translation of our priority document KR'679 is being submitted herewith. Therefore, withdrawal of the Kim reference is respectfully requested.

Lastly, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kawakima discusses the Applicants "at least one connection member is vertically positioned to the bottom supporting part" as recited in claim 22. However, the Examiner does not point out which feature shown in Kawakima is comparable to the Applicants "at least one connection member". It appears that Kawakima merely discusses a *vibrating* compressor having external and internal iron cores, a permanent magnet and an electromagnetic coil vibratably supported by a mechanical vibrating system when in a magnetic gap between the two iron cores to drive a piston connected thereto

(see Abstract and column 2, lines 40-58). Kawakima discusses a pole piece 13 fixedly fitted to a bottom by the magnet 12 by means of a screw (see FIG. 3 and column 5, lines 19-21), the Applicants respectfully submit that this is not comparable to "an inner core assembly comprising...an upper cover combined to an upper part of the inner core, a bottom supporting part combined to a bottom of the inner core, a magnet disposed in an opening of the inner core assembly, and at least one connection member passing through the inner core, to connect the upper cover with the bottom supporting part" as recited in amended claim 11, from which dependent claim 22 depends.

Based upon the comments mentioned above, any and all combination of the foregoing references fails to establish a prima face case of obviousness over the present invention. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or discuss all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8-23-07

By: 

Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501